

2 of 8

28, and 51; page 17 lines 15-20). As discussed below, these amendments are respectfully submitted to place these claims in clearly allowable form.

The references applied to the claims in the parent application were **Pazanni**, **Evans**, and **McAndrews**. None are concerned with selecting treatment regimens for a patient afflicted with a *chronic* disease or condition. As an initial matter, note that **Pazanni** is concerned with *in vitro* viral sensitivity. While administering drugs to an actual patient based upon *in vitro* viral sensitivity may indeed control the virus, it may well be detrimental to the patient. In contrast, the invention of claims 1, 24 and 47 generates a listing of available treatments based upon knowledge of prior therapeutic treatments the patient has received for that chronic disease, and generates advisory information *for the patient* rather than simply for the organism being treated. With respect to **Evans**, again note that this was for in-hospital patients afflicted with an acute disease (bacterial infection) rather than a chronic disease or condition. With respect to **McAndrews**, note that a plurality of different therapeutic treatments for a particular disease was not provided and that the product did not generate a list of available treatments (to the contrary, McAndrew gives a proposal of whether or not to approve a previously proposed treatment). Further note that McAndrew did not give advisory information in conjunction with treatments (*e.g.*, the “information” and “synopsis” modes of McAndrew are separate from the “guided” and “structured” modes).

Finally, the same amendments to the claims made to resolve section 112 concerns in the parent application have also been made herein to expedite examination of this case.

## **2. Formal Drawings.**

Formal drawings are submitted concurrently herewith. These formal drawings include the same amendment to Fig. 12B to include reference sign A2 that was proposed by the Examiner and approved in the parent application. No new matter is added and entry of these formal drawings is respectfully requested.

A

*kdS*

**3. Conclusion.**

In view of the above amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Kenneth D. Sibley*  
Kenneth D. Sibley  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 31,665

Correspondence Address:  
USPTO Customer No.: **20792**  
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC  
P.O. Box 37428  
Raleigh, NC 27627  
Telephone: (919) 854-1400  
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

**CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING**

Express Mail Label No. EL533609481US  
Date of Deposit: March 10, 2000

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Box Patent Application, Assistant Commissioner For Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

*Kenneth D. Sibley*  
Kenneth D. Sibley  
Date of Signature: March 10, 2000

A